

Vertical File
V. 175
#24

LETTER

TO

Mr. MATTHEW H. RICHEY

AGAINST REVIVING

A REIGN OF CORRUPTION

AND ESTABLISHING

A POLICY OF PROTECTION

**"To make the Rich Man Richer,
and the Poor Man Poorer."**

Public Archives of Nova Scotia
HALIFAX, N. S.

HALIFAX, JANUARY, 1878.

THE UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO

THE UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO

THE UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO

THE UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO

THE UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO

THE UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO

THE UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO

THE UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO

THE UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO

THE UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO

MATTHEW H. RICHEY, Esq.:

Dear Sir,—

When you invited me to vote for you at the coming election, it occurred to me that you were unconscious of the position in which you have allowed yourself to be placed by a few unreasonable men in this city. I am quite sure you have never, for one moment, fully comprehended the keen intelligence of this constituency on public matters.

You have somehow, I observe, fallen into the error of supposing that you can escape taking a well-defined position in the contest. Any other course, however, would be deceptive and dishonorable. And you must excuse me for saying that about the only qualification claimed for you, even by your friends, as a representative for Halifax, is *respectability*. You must be aware how you came to be selected. It was decided by a few disappointed politicians that it would not do to bring out a man who was in any manner soiled by the

PACIFIC SCANDAL.

A respectable merchant was applied to and refused. The most prudent men of the Opposition had, from the first, expressed themselves satisfied to permit MR. JONES to go to the House of Commons unopposed.

When you were first approached by the Hon. James McDonald (who could not get a nomination) you declined. McDonald distinctly pointed out how it was possible to avoid raising any issue as to the character of the public men whom you wish to get into power. He pointed out how you could pretend you were standing on your own bottom and yet receive all the Opposition votes. Still fearful that direct issues would be raised, and that you might be invited to meet a criticizing public, you hesitated. Then it was that Dr. Tupper was appealed to, and, still reluctant, you hesitated. You had expressed yourself

positively in favor of deferring any contest till next summer. And it was not until you found that you would be passed over by your new friends that you consented to take a plunge into that stream which has buried forever the political hopes of many an aspiring politician.

I admit you would have preferred a nomination to support the McKenzie Government or any other honest Government rather than one organized by Sir John McDonald, Peter Mitchell and Charles Tupper, but you cannot help seeing that those into whose hands you have got are the reckless followers of these three public characters and you cannot point out to me a single ringleader of those who was not instrumental in victimizing Donald Robb who had, you must admit, a better knowledge of public matters and was a better speaker than you.

In your card you invite a "declaration of want of confidence in the present administration," and although you there explicitly declare your adherence to the Liberal Conservative party, you endeavored in Temperance Hall to shirk the responsibility of the conduct of your leaders. You are evidently not accustomed to writing election cards, and I have no doubt you would now gladly revise your first production. Sir John McDonald has in his day, though now rapidly growing old, buried politically more of such aspiring and incautious men as you appear to be than would fill your small committee room.

In 1866-7 you and others who were captivated by the idea of

CONFEDERATION.

never dreamed at first of giving up our independence in violation of the will of the people.

John A. McDonald, who had for some time lost the confidence of the Upper Provinces, and whose days of power were nearly numbered, was the evil spirit who found no difficulty in inspiring a Tupper against the earnest appeals of many honest men in the Confederate camp to stifle the voice of the electors. That was the very first time the hand of the Tory Chief was felt in our affairs, and that brought us to the brink of revolution. His chief object was by burying old issues to keep him-

self in power. Do you think that record gives him any claim to the support of you or any other Confederate among us? I think not. The British North America Act having been carried by him and his allies, the people of this Province were ready to walk straight out of the Union. Joseph Howe was then in the full vigor of his life and the power of his intellect. The shock was too much for him, and—in body and mind—he broke down. In that condition he was induced by McDonald to give up his old opinions and the cherished friendships of a life time, and the curtain too soon fell on one of the saddest scenes ever enacted on the political stage. Mr. Howe sacrificed his own position to prevent an insurrection, and Sir John McDonald with all the power and prestige and intrigue at his command in four years lost the honest and voluntary support of the new Dominion from one end to the other. In 1872 he dared not appeal to the honest sentiment of the country. You know just what he did. He sat deliberately down to prepare a scheme to debauch the constituencies of his country. *Three hundred and sixty thousand dollars* were secretly used in carrying the elections of 1872. You gave your independent vote with all the corrupted ones cast here in Halifax at that time. You were not aware of the gigantic frauds carried on under cover of a

PACIFIC RAILWAY.

You and I have discovered all that since. Do you think, Mr. RICHBY, that you can now deceive the simplest elector in Halifax County? When the news of the exposure of the widespread corruption of the elections of 1872 swept over the country, men looked into each other's faces with alarm. Premier McDonald, in the first frenzy of the moment, made a most solemn and emphatic denial. He called God to witness that his hands were clean! A good many weeks passed before Lord Dufferin could realize that this was a deliberate lie. According to your card you want to put the Government out and put other men in. Who are the other men? Don't for a moment pretend that you have not made up your mind. I observe with hope-

fulness that you are ashamed to admit it—but you cannot deny that there is a most desperate though hopeless struggle going on in certain quarters to bring back to power McDonald, Langevin, Tupper and Mitchell. How did you vote in January, 1874? Your nightly prayer and your daily struggle—the feverish desire of your mind blinded for the moment by political passion and vanity—is now to put somebody into possession of the Public Treasury and humbly follow and support them. The general election, you remember, was in January, 1874. How, I ask you, did you vote? The same men who nominated an opposition to ALFRED JONES then have nominated you now. He was returned by a majority of *two thousand one hundred and forty-five*, to stamp out the disgrace brought on us by Sir John McDonald and his colleagues. Are you now inviting me to put these men in again? Why, these men were overthrown by a perfect hurricane of popular indignation for *personal corruption*. Professor Goldwin Smith declared the transaction “worse than simple theft,” and insisted that if its perpetrators were to escape, the doors of our prisons should be thrown open for the poor and sorely tempted criminal who had not at any rate betrayed a high public trust. This you read in January, 1874, and I again ask you whether you voted for or against these high-toned politicians on that occasion?

Have you any promise that they have *reformed*? Are they coming back to do the very things they were turned out for doing? Is there one man who will vote for a repetition of the transactions which at the time drew upon Canada the eyes of the civilized world—transactions so startling, so shameful, so inexcusable as to awaken the unanimous condemnation of the great press of England? What would be the excuse in other countries for bringing back these men? These men have less prospect of returning to power than you have of becoming an Archbishop. Do you not know such a change would shock the moral sense of independent public men abroad? But let me come home. What excuse have *you* to offer to your own conscience as a Canadian and a christian man? You call yourself respectable. I know there have been

a few—very few—instances, even of men calling themselves ministers of religion, who have pretended to justify all the swindling and frauds which have been unearthed by the Government and Parliament for the last four years, but—well, I will not go into that now.

Has there been offered one single word of *contrition* or *regret* for the bold and scandalous and infamous transactions of ministers, raising money on a pledge to recoup it at the expense of the public works of the country, for the purpose of corrupting and debauching the public electoral mind and conscience? You talk glibly about “the principles professed by the

LIBERAL CONSERVATIVE PARTY

being sincerely and firmly held.” What do you mean by a “Liberal Conservative?” Are you aware that phrase was invented by Sir John McDonald? Are there any *new* principles or *new* men? None whatever. The policy of that party—in office—has been, and would be, on becoming odious to the country, to secretly organize, at all hazards, a fraudulent return to power. You should speak out distinctly, and more clearly define a “Liberal Conservative.” Who is the Liberal Conservative you want to take the reins of power? I could better understand your position if there had been *repentance* and *reform*, but the boldness, the confidence with which you seem to take it for granted that the public admire Liberal Conservatism—a delicate phrase for corruption and fraud, in high places—entirely surpasses my comprehension.

You have, I regret to say, the same men—the same policy of profligacy and corruption openly and exultingly avowed. Your leader in Parliament has defied Canadian public opinion by the lamentable and unblushing declaration that he had the solace of the example of Walpole in all his use of money, and you know *he* was the most scandalously corrupt statesman who ever prostituted the position of Minister in England. You have the same men, the same policy, the same danger to the public credit and the character of the country—and what is most important—the same baneful, unmitigated example of successful

political fraud, before the eyes of the rising young men of Canada, and before those children of yours and mine whom Mr. Tupper is so very anxious to save from the payment of interest. You would repeat in the history of the New Dominion the dark blot which stains its first page, and render the experiment of self-government under Federation here in the North a bye word and a scandal in all parts of the globe for many generations to come.

If the exposure in 1873 of electoral ministerial corruption in 1872 had closed the record of political iniquity by the late government, your present attempt to stagger under the weight of their sins would not be so humiliating as it really is, but each succeeding month has revealed some clumsily concealed speculation of the past. You are familiar with them all. They are

NOT CASES OF DOUBT.

Every hideous feature and lineament of each despicable transaction has been exposed like repulsive corpses in the face of Parliament, beyond the possibility of evasion. So damning and crushing has been the effect that the policy of concocting counter-charges has been found more profitable than denial or palliation. No repeated challenge by Premier McKenzie for Parliamentary investigation—no persistent straightforward and explicit course of complete refutation—not even judicial investigation and criminal convictions of the slanderers will silence the throats of "Liberal-Conservative" orators when out of the reach of detection.

Peter Mitchell is one of the men whom it appears to be your ambition to follow. You must excuse me for informing the public what you know as well as I do about him. He was Minister of Marine—an office which you want to get for him again, and which you will get for him if you and others manage to turn out the Government. Peter Mitchell does not profess to be a moralist or a reformer. I am bound to confess that you would not have done what he did. He pretended he wanted

A LIGHT SHIP

for Halifax harbor. He had a brother-in-law in England—Hawes. As Minister he sent there to order this vessel—of 130 tons. She was floated across the Atlantic, and I believe appeared at the mouth of Halifax Harbor. She was useless, and was taken somewhere up the St. Lawrence out of *our* sight. The official Journals have informed you that she was one hundred and thirty tons, that Mitchell employed his relative to procure the vessel, that he paid for this service a large commission, and that he took out of the Treasury *one hundred and thirty thousand dollars* and sent that sum to Mr. Hawes. All this you and I know. How much was paid for the vessel none of us know. We know he never paid the enormous price of \$130,000.00. He never could have paid the half or quarter of that sum.

I can form no idea why you want to get Mr. Mitchell into office. If you had asked me to vote for you, to keep him out I could have understood you.

We also know that Mr. Mitchell was not satisfied in confining his transactions in England with his brother-in-law to his own department. One Hector Louis Langevin was Sir John's Minister of Public Works at the time. This man absorbed \$25,000 or \$30,000 of Sir Hugh Allan's money, but it is not believed that he was even honest enough to spend it in paying it to electors. He put it into his pocket. Mr. Carvell, in Langevin's department, was another of Mitchell's brothers-in-law, and among them they employed Mr. Hawes to buy

STEEL RAILS

for the Intercolonial Railway—6000 tons. The Reform Government detected that the purchase of these rails in the name of the brother-in-law was only a cover to obtain money from the Treasury, and commenced an action to expose the fraud in England. For a long time Mr. Hawes evaded service, but at length a judgment was recovered for twenty thousand dollars. Another transaction of twenty-five or thirty thousand also came to light and another suit was commenced, and, I believe, judgment has recently been obtained in that case.

In the case of the present Government, the rails were purchased, not at the recommendation of Carvell, who was dismissed from office, but at the request of Dr. Tupper's friend, Mr. Fleming, who was not dismissed. They were bought for \$54, while the others cost \$85 per ton. And I believe Mr. Fleming was telling the truth when he said it was necessary to order them long in advance, as it would take a year to get them conveyed to their distant destinations. Even if Mr. McKenzie made a blunder, does not all Canada know as you do, and rejoice as I do, that we have an honest Minister, and a far abler statesman than any of his opponents.

I have said nothing about your throwiug yourself into the arms of the man who gave the

PICTOU RAILWAY CONTRACT

to his friend, by which illegal transaction somebody made between three and four hundred thousand dollars. Senator McLellan in denouncing Tupper in that transaction called him the "High Priest of Jobbery and Corruption." This was in 1866. Adams Archibald then said of Tupper that "he descended to the miserable position of the pettiest criminal offender." When this crime was pressed against Dr. Tupper in Cumberland, he induced the man he had made Lieutenant-Governor to write a letter denying that he had ever imputed fraud to the gentleman. You and I need not quarrel about phrases. We know Mr. Archibald did more than charge the crime—he proved it. The Debates of '66 shew this. Here are his words concerning the conduct of Avar Longley and Chas. Tupper in that transaction :

"Take the Railway Commissioner (Longley) on his own shewing; take the Provincial Secretary (Tupper) as his Commissioner paints him. We have these two gentlemen, like the two heads of the Fenian faction, meditating a raid on the public treasury; and the only strife between them is who shall be first to pocket the plunder. This, one might imagine in a Roberts or an O'Mahoney, but the most vivid fancy could hardly picture one of these worthies after the shameless bargain was made and the raid committed and the plunder pock-

“eted, talking of his share in the transaction in tones of Christian humility characterizing it as an act of virtuous abnegation.”

If I correctly recollect you were present in the gallery cheering Mr. Archibald. You may perhaps remember he appealed to the House:—

“If the Government be allowed to violate the law and any future Government should place their hands in the Treasury for selfish or corrupt purposes the people of that day will have a right to point to you and say—‘The turning point was with you. If you had done your duty this precedent would never have been followed.’”

Archibald’s resolution was defeated and Tupper was transferred to the Ottawa Government, which we very naturally expect to detect making money out of other Railways. Heaven only knows to what extent.

THE NORTHERN RAILWAY

owed the late Government, and the Government was about to write off a large portion of the debt. This was the opportunity to compel that corporation to come down handsomely. Mr. McKenzie suspecting frauds issued a Royal Commission and the following sums were proved last winter, as you know, to have been corruptly pocketed by persons “in” or engaged in corrupt schemes “of” the Ministry:

Drawn for Sir F. Hinck’s election.....	\$1,000 00
Paid for Sir John’s testimonial.....	2,500 00
Paid for support of Sir John’s newspaper.....	2,000 00
Drawn for J. B. Robinson’s election (supporter of Sir John).....	5,440 00
Paid Election expenses, 1872 (Lib.-Con.).....	1,000 00
Paid J. B. Cumberland’s election, 1873.....	4,166 90
Paid for Parliamentary expenses.....	3,750 00
Paid Hewitt Bernard, 1868.....	500 00

The above are some of the items.

A Committee of Parliament last year reported that *Twenty-seven Tho sand Dollars* of the people’s money had been corruptly drawn. This included the money paid for the *Testimonial*, and so inexcusable were the frauds that they were admitted by Sir John and Tupper, and a vote passed *without oppo-*

sition for the re-payment to the Treasury of \$27,000, which has been refunded. You and I heard the quantity of pathetic arithmetical calculations poured out by Tupper, the other night, about the amount of interest our children must pay for the mistakes of the present Government. It is a satisfaction to us as it will be to them to know if Mr. McKenzie continues to secure returns of money fraudulently abstracted by the "*Liberal-Conservative*" party before you restore them to power the burden of our poor children will be somewhat diminished. You have raised old issues by adopting the men who have never purged themselves of old crimes.

I would really like you to say in case you succeed in getting out the Government and getting Sir John and Tupper in, what you propose to do with the numerous suits pending for recovery of public money. Take for example the

SECRET SERVICE FRAUDS.

The men whom you are striving to get back to power you know spent about *one hundred thousand dollars* annually under cover of what they facetiously termed "secret service." I admit it *was* a secret service. Notwithstanding their control of a corrupt and subservient majority they were compelled to submit to a resolution to produce the vouchers to a committee of leaders from both sides, as in England. When Sir John was expelled from power in 1873 he went to the Bank and got all the vouchers and checks and destroyed them and refused to render any account. He did worse. He had a large balance from \$27,000 to \$30,000. He should have left this in the Treasury, but he kept it secretly in the Bank of Montreal. He did more. Only last year he paid out \$6600—he says to his friends—and refuses to account for this. The present Government has sued him for the money and unless you and others get into the House the money will be restored as you are aware. There is a cry that these are immaterial questions. You can scarcely make the electors believe these are *dead* issues, for suits are going on in the Courts while you read my letter.

Coming to our own Province, you are aware of the suit in our Supreme Court arising from the much discussed

CAR SPRINGS.

When Charles Tupper and James McDonald had aroused the electors by the Pictou Railway Job, and the refusal to consult them on Confederation, they prepared for carrying their two several Counties. Tupper had a bosom friend who was printing for the Government. McDonald had brought from Pictou a raw and illiterate cousin and put him over the heads of clerks in the Railway Office. Neither of these persons had ever heard of or seen such a thing as a car spring, nor had either of them the slightest knowledge of the hardware trade. Halifax had many old wealthy and respectable hardware firms. Tupper and McDonald arranged that these men should supply iron and railway material for the Government—and set them up as a new hardware firm. Subsequent events exposed the scheme by which these two politicians obtained money to corrupt Pictou and Cumberland. “Our hands were never out of our pockets,” said Alpin Grant frankly, before a Parliamentary Committee. The books of the firm shew that enormous prices were paid by Carvell under the pretext of buying car springs and other material. They shew that enormous sums were drawn out, much of which went to Cumberland. Thousands went out of that business for Mr. McDonald's election. The books can be examined. You know Mr. McKenzie ordered a suit for the restoration of money by the firm. Is it any wonder it became bankrupt? A portion of the dividends will go back into the Treasury. A portion of the cash which went into the pocket of the Hon. James McDonald has been paid back by that worthy wire-puller, who has been the chief instrument in bringing you into your present humiliating position. How then can you say you are not supporting a party involved in scandals?

I understand you desire to tax the poor man's fuel by placing a

DUTY ON COAL.

There may be men who believe this will stimulate trade; but that is not the object of the man you are now willing to serve. Do you know why Mr. Tupper wishes to tax foreign coal? During

the last fatal days of his rule in Nova Scotia there were known to exist rich seams of bituminous coal underlying upwards of three thousand acres in Cumberland. As the law stood, but one license could be granted, covering only six hundred acres of this large area. Applications had frequently been made in vain to the Government for the balance. Mr. Provincial Secretary Tupper procured a secret order in Council to throw these open to applicants. On Wednesday at eleven o'clock this order was made public in the *Gazette*. Charles Black, however, had applied at ten o'clock of the same morning with applications covering this whole area. It is true, Mr. Tupper's name did not appear on the record, but when discovered selling the property in London—having gone thither at the public expense—he admitted he was interested in the mines, but insisted that he had paid money to Black. Upon this announcement an investigation was demanded in the Legislature, and when Mr. Charles Black was summoned as a witness he refused to appear. If any further questions should arise on this subject there are three or four men, including Senator McFarlane, Charles Stewart and Dr. Lewis, who can give truthful evidence. I am not aware how much interest Tupper has in the mines. He has none in his own name—and may have none at all—but considering the character of this one transaction, I think he is not the man to insist on a tax which I contend has a tendency to increase the price of fuel for every man in this province.

I think I can teach you sufficient about the coal question to convince you that it was not worth the price of Charles Tupper's ticket from Toronto to bring him here to coach you on that subject. We are told that MR. JONES, as our member, refused to allow the manufacturers of Ontario, assisted by Mr. Tupper, "of Toronto," to impose burdens on the people of Nova Scotia under the shallow offer of a worse than useless protection sop of fifty cents duty on hard coal. But for whom was this snare set by Tupper, and for whom is it now laid by you MR. MATTHEW RICHEY? "The petitioners!" is the cry of your friends. You publish the names of a number of respectable men who have supported hitherto Premier McKenzie.

To induce you to offer for the Commons, it was whispered in your ear as it is now dinned in the public ear that ALFRED JONES refused the petition of disappointed supporters of his who are coal owners. You are now discovering that you will not gain one of these votes. Truth compels me to say, moreover that, with the exception of such men as Mr. Moren and Mr. Lithgow, these men have themselves comparatively little interest in coal. Some of them, it is true, have spent honestly earned money, but most of them will admit that they have never developed the mines. They are simply owners, at a very small figure, of undeveloped coal areas, such as those which Tupper *bought*. One English enterprise alone in coal in this province represents upward of *three millions of dollars*; and that company was not a petitioner. Almost the entire ownership of the *bona fide* coal interest in this province, as Mr. Lithgow will admit, is a non-resident ownership. And the men who control this interest—including Sir Hugh Allan—will admit that a tax of fifty cents or even a hundred cents on foreign anthracite coal, even if it were fair—or could be obtained pure and simple—would be useless.

But could it be obtained, or would it be fair? A cry to tax flour or salt would be popular with a certain class in Ontario and when the Liberal Conservative speakers are in those parts, they cry out for protection to flour and salt. In the towns of Ontario, where large quantities of American Coal are used, your anxious friend, Dr. Tupper, makes long and tiresome speeches but he never touches coal. He keeps as clear of that as you did of sugar in Temperance Hall.

Do you want to hear how a high-minded and magnanimous statesman of Ontario "protects" our interests there? Here is a protection that we can appreciate. Alexander McKenzie is speaking to an audience of 10,000 people at New Market, and there are electors present who have been listening to the Tupperian promises of protection on flour. The Premier says:—

"It is quite true that in one respect the miller might be benefited, as we supply the great bulk of the flour to the mining regions of Nova Scotia. We might compel them to take our flour at higher prices, by preventing them from buying

"from Portland or Boston. But this could not be done without *"inflicting an act of injustice on those people."*

There were fifteen or twenty thousand people at a great Reform Demonstration at Clinton, and Mr. McKenzie spoke as follows to the millers, and he was cheered by Western men :—

"Suppose a duty was imposed that would enable you to go to the Lower Provinces. The fishermen in Nova Scotia, New Brunswick and Prince Edward Island have a considerable trade with Portland, Boston and other towns in the United States. They sell their fish and bring back flour generally as ballast, carrying it for 10 or 15 cents per barrel. If we were to impose a duty of 25 or 50 cents on flour *it would destroy these people's trade in time, which amounts to perhaps 40,000 or 50,000 barrels per year.* To the extent of that duty on the flour which goes by Boston and New York *our millers might get the advantage.* But how can you go to work and tax the people's bread [which Dr. Tupper had advocated] in the Lower Provinces unless you allow them to tax something elsewhere?"

Previous to confederation we had cause occasionally to turn to the course pursued by the public men of Canada, and ever since that memorable event, you and I have watched, with great interest, the subject of

TAXATION AND DEBT.

We could live under a tariff of ten per cent. Canada in 1866, was struggling for life as Tupper described her in our Legislature—striving then to prevent Confederation—on the brink of bankruptcy. She had been languishing under a protective tariff of twenty-five per cent. No man dared to advocate protection in the Maritime Provinces. Our free trade doctrine was the stumbling block to Union. We were warned in tones not to be mistaken that we would fall under the Protection axe of the Upper Provinces. Immediately preceding the loss of our independence, a slight movement took place in Canada towards free trade. The Confederate Delegates were in London endeavoring to force the British North America Act through the Imperial Parliament. The people of Nova Scotia sent delegates to prevent its passage, and by means of a public

letter penned by Mr. Annand, undertook to refute the argument of the Canadians, and he ridiculed the free trade promises of Canada as a delusion and a snare to deceive Nova Scotia. His argument was felt by the members of the House of Commons, and the Canadians put forward the late Judge McCully as a fitting member of the Canadian Delegation to reply.

Tupper had previously at the Albion Tavern loudly declared himself a Free Trader. These are the words Mr. McCully was authorized to address to the members of the British Ministry and Parliament. He is dealing with Mr. Annand's pamphlet:—

"The principal object of this writer (Mr. Annand) is evidently to create ill-feeling if possible, and foment discord between the manufacturing classes of Great Britain, and the people of Canada. During the recent Session of their Legislature, the Canadians in view of Confederation, have pronounced against Protection, and struck out boldly in favor of a Free Trade policy. This Mr. Annand charges upon the Canadian Government and Legislature as mere dissimulation; an attempt to wheedle the Maritime Provinces into Confederation, and to conciliate public opinion in this country until the measure is passed. The averment is as unsubstantiated as it is disingenuous. A Protection policy once abandoned, in any Legislature, is not likely ever again to be re-enacted. If it be what its friends and advocates contend it is, not only the more rational but the more prosperous policy, how does Mr. Annand expect that under Confederation the Legislature, *with such an infusion of free traders as the Maritime Colonies would supply*.—how does he expect that the country can ever again fall back to Protection? Nothing could be more unlikely."

This, according to Mr. Howe, was the darkest hour of our country's history. The aspiring Dr. Tupper has since left his Province, and has become a resident of Toronto, and is now struggling with all his might in the interest of the manufacturers of the West to force us into a Protective policy, to become the hewers of wood and drawers of water for our more powerful neighbors. "Nothing could be more *unlikely*," said Judge McCully, and yet, though he has slept but a year in an untimely grave, you are assisting Tupper to pull us "back to Protection,"

and I must add, to bring poverty and misfortune upon your Province."

The Pacific Railway is a

ROAD USELESS TO US.

It will cost \$150,000⁰⁰⁰ to \$200,000⁰⁰⁰, or, according to the calculation of the member for Cumberland, *Two Hundred and Eighty Millions of Dollars*. The figures were stretched probably for a purpose. The other party complain that the road is not to be built in ten years. Have you considered that the whole amount of the Fisheries Award would not pay even for the survey—which has already cost six millions. As Mr. McKenzie forcibly said, the whole of Europe could not furnish resources sufficient to complete the line as rapidly as your party undertook to do it. Such a mad scheme would overwhelm with taxation and beggary every Province of the Dominion. On what grounds of reason or justice do you propose to levy a tax on salt, on flour, on coal, on clothing, on everything for impossible millions to build a Railway over what Mr. Blake described as a "sea of mountains" and through a howling wilderness? The great fishing interests, the lumbering interest, the ship building enterprise should be considered. Are they not sufficiently burdened already? Are you not, in fact, entirely ignorant of these subjects? We have everything to

LOSE BY PROTECTION,

and nothing to gain. I know what the Great West wants if Sir John and Tupper have their way. Many there are watching to break faith with the Maritime Provinces. Instead of assisting Tupper to place a burden of millions on the working men you ought to sound the note of alarm. The people will teach you a wholesome lesson, and no candidate in these Maritime Provinces will ever again dare for a moment to entertain the idea of "Liberal Conservative" protection. Extravagant and wild expenditure on the Pacific Railway is the great scourge which your leaders hold in store for these Lower Provinces. Why is it that neither you nor Dr. Tupper can

offer the slightest explanation for delaying to *extend the Railway into Halifax*. Dr. Tupper and the Protectionists were always willing to spend millions in the West but not a dollar in Halifax or Nova Scotia. Mr. Jones always insisted that we should have an equivalent for all monies spent on the Pacific Railway, and he has secured it. He has obtained the most important extension of the Intercolonial Railway—at the expense of half a million of dollars scattered among our people—into this the Winter Port probably for all time to come of the Dominion of Canada. Why do you not speak out boldly on these questions. You may read the some passages from

ADAM SMITH

till you are blind, and cry out for Protection till you become black in the face, you cannot prove that it is fair to tax our fishermen, farmers and laborers, or obstruct Mr. JONES in his laudable zeal to secure for this Port the mighty trade of the Great West.

Even if in private life your character for respectability was not irreproachable—which I freely admit it is—I would not follow the deplorable example of your organ and attack you. I have much respect for you in many ways, and I know in reading these lines you will admit that I have treated you fairly in pointing out the political position which you have chosen to occupy. I am afraid your public record is characterized by vacillation and weakness. You should—if you contemplated public life—have taken a decided stand at the elections in January 1874. But it is said that you were then ready to take the stump—certainly on the wrong side—with those who raised their voices in justification of the Pacific Railway exposures.

MR. JONES took a public stand twenty years ago and has maintained it consistently. He has been ten years representing Halifax, and no man has ever even whispered a charge of corruption against him. He has never even sought the position which many think he should hold. It is even matter of complaint in the Reform Party, that he should not accept a seat in the Ministry, and he is in danger of losing support on that ground.

What reasons or qualifications can you shew for coming forward to take his seat. I could understand Dr. Almon claiming the support of his party. What is your public record? I believe you delivered an address in favor of Confederation. You have made a very fair civic official. I believe you could not make up your mind to canvass with Dr. Almon in 1874. At any rate the moment you found the strength of the political storm in your face, you took shelter on neutral territory. Shortly afterwards you thought you observed a popular current turning against the school system, and joined an agitation with men who were not seeking popularity. They made you President of

THE SCHOOL ASSOCIATION,

but the moment you began to doubt the success of the project you retired from the struggle. I doubt whether you gained the confidence of any one by that move. You boast of your freedom from partizanship. You propose to yourself, under the circumstances, a very doubtful compliment indeed.

In the present contest you have, as usual, entirely mistaken the feeling of the people, and I venture to predict that instead of standing by your guns to fight through the desperate campaign now inaugurated in Nova Scotia by your new leaders for a revival, at the general election, of the Reign of Corruption and a policy of Protection "to make the rich man richer, and the poor man poorer," you will, on your defeat on the 29th instant, at the end of the first battle, retire from the field a wiser and a more contented man.

Yours, sincerely,

AN ELECTOR.